



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,578	01/23/2001	Ilya Trakht	55099-B/JPW/KRD	2749

7590 06/25/2003

John P. White, Esq.
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

SCHWADRON, RONALD B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,578

Applicant(s)

Trakt

Examiner

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 29-34 are under consideration. Claims 1,2,8,13-28,35-39,47,60,61 have been canceled.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

2. It is noted that the specification defines "trioma" as a cell line formed from the fusion of three cells wherein a human-murine hybridoma is fused with a human lymphoid cell (see page 23, lines 19-24).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oestberg et al. (US Patent 4,634,664) for the reasons elaborated in the previous Office Action. Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive.

Oestberg et al. teach xenogeneic hybridoma fusion partners that do not produce

antibody and the use of said cells as fusion partners to produce monoclonal antibodies upon fusion with an antibody producing cell (see column 2, last paragraph and column 3). Oestberg et al. teach that the nonantibody producing xenogeneic hybridoma fusion partner can be made by fusing a myeloma cell to a human lymphocyte (see column 2, last paragraph, continued on column 3). Oestberg et al. teach that the myeloma cell used can be a hybrid cell formed from the fusion of two cells (see column 2, last paragraph). Thus, Oestberg et al. teach use of a three cell containing xenogeneic hybridoma fusion partner that does not produce antibody and the use of said cells as fusion partners to produce monoclonal antibodies. Oestberg et al. do not teach that the cell is a trioma as per the definition of the term in the specification (eg. "trioma" as a cell line formed from the fusion of three cells wherein a human-murine hybridoma is fused with a human lymphoid cell). Oestberg et al. teach heteromyeloma cell fusion partners (eg. mouse/human fused cells, see claim 14). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have produced the claimed method because Oestberg et al. teach the claimed method except for use of a trioma cell line formed from the fusion of three cells wherein a human-murine hybridoma is fused with a human lymphoid cell, Oestberg teach use of three cell nonantibody producing xenogeneic hybridoma fusion partner containing a hybrid myeloma cell and Oestberg et al. teach human heteromyeloma cells (mouse human hybrid myeloma cell line). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do the aforementioned because Oestberg et al. teach use of hybrid myelomas as the fusion partner with a nonantibody secreting human lymphocyte (see column 2, last paragraph, continued on next page) to form a three cell nonantibody secreting fusion partner and also teaches heteromyeloma cell fusion partners (eg. mouse/human fused cells). The antibody producing hybrid cells can be used in vitro or in vivo to produce antibody (see claim 18). The cells are grown in vitro under conditions in which antibody is produced (see examples). Oestberg et al. teach freeze storage of desired antibody secreting cells (see column 7, penultimate paragraph). The various assay steps recited in claim 30 involve art known steps for immunoassays (see Examples in Oestberg et al.). The condition recited in claim 30 could be any of the art known diseases disclosed in column 4 of Oestberg et al.

Applicant has argued that Oestberg et al. teach use of a heterohybridoma, not a heteromyeloma. However, the specification appears to define said terms as interchangeable. The specification does not specifically define the terms heteromyeloma

or heterohybridoma. However, as previously noted, the specification defines "trioma" as a cell line formed from the fusion of three cells wherein a human-murine hybridoma is fused with a human lymphoid cell (see page 23, lines 19-24). The specification also discloses that, "The present invention provides a trioma cell obtained by fusing a heteromyeloma cell which does not produce any antibody with a human lymphoid cell." (page 3, lines 15-17). The only way these two statements can be reconciled is if the two terms (human-murine hybridoma (a.k.a. heterohybridoma) and heteromyeloma) are used interchangeably.

5. Claim 34 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 at (703) 308-4242.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ron Schwadron whose telephone number is (703) 308-4680. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to

Serial No. 09/767578
Art Unit 1644

5

6:00. A message may be left on the examiners voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ~~1800~~



1600

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644